

consider in due course, but in the terms of the present bill there is nothing in Standing Order 60 to impede its progress.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has already spoken on the point of order. We could go on for a long time if the hon. member for Edmonton West were to reply to the minister. I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wishes to contribute to the procedural argument.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall speak very briefly on the point. I think it is salutary for a member like the hon. member for Edmonton West to raise the point every once in a while—and I have heard him raise it before—that advantage should not be taken of the rules to the extent of bringing in budgetary changes very often without a budget presentation. I believe that is the point he was trying to make. He underlined the point, of course, that it would be politically rather stupid for a government to go any length of time without a budget presentation. I must, however, say to my good friend who sits close to me that I do not share the same anxiety that he has expressed about Standing Order 60.

I ask you, Sir, and I ask him to look at this. Standing Order 60 is made up of 11 different paragraphs. I ask you also to note that Standing Order 61, which has only one paragraph, also relates to the question of ways and means. I admit that I am playing a little numbers game here, but let me do it. This means that there are 12 items or paragraphs in the rule book regarding ways and means, 11 paragraphs of Standing Order 60 plus the one paragraph that makes up Standing Order 61. Of those 12 paragraphs, one, namely Standing Order 60 (2), is general in nature in that it provides for the designation of an order of the day for considering a ways and means motion. The other 11 fall this way: two of them, Standing Order 60 (1) and Standing Order 60 (11) under which it is possible for a minister of finance to make a tax change without a budget presentation, and the other nine; in other words, the other eight paragraphs as well as Standing Order 61, relate to the machinery for a budget presentation.

So I suggest to you, Sir, that if we drew 12 paragraphs having to do with ways and means and we applied nine of them to the process that involves a budget presentation—the speech and the six day debate—we made it pretty clear that that is what we expect to be the normal practice. I suggest that if any government went any length of time trying to rely on Standing Order 60 (1) and (11) to avoid a budget speech, the government would lose all the time it gained by the time the point of order was debated.

• (1550)

As I already said, I think that this is a useful viewpoint to be raised. Governments have to be reminded of what they ought to do. But I do not think that Standing Order 60 and Standing Order 61 are all that deficient. They make it possible for a change such as is proposed today to be undertaken without a six day budget debate, but the rules make it pretty clear that it is the intention of parlia-

Income Tax Act

ment that at least once a year there will be a full dress six-day debate on a budget presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think the hon. members would want me to go into detailed references on the interesting point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The point he is making, I think, has been explained, and is supported to some extent by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

While the hon. member for Edmonton West was speaking, there was a thought going through my mind that perhaps he was not entirely right when he suggested that under the old rules there was a procedural requirement that there be a budget presentation. According to the advice or information that I have, there has never been such a requirement in the rules. There has been a practice, under the old rules, that there be a budget presentation, but there was nothing in the Standing Orders, as they existed then, requiring that a budget presentation be made.

With respect to the hon. member's suggestion that it is a new procedure to have a ways and means bill which is based on a presentation of a budget in a previous session, it has been brought to my attention that perhaps this has been done before, more particularly in the year 1962, where the index has a reference to a budget resolution passed in a previous session. This, in itself, is an indication that even in the year 1962 this procedure was followed. It has also been brought to my attention that there was a ruling by then Mr. Speaker Lambert, which is reported at page 133 of the *Journals* for 1962, regarding whether or not ways and means legislation should be preceded by a budget presentation. I am sure the hon. member remembers the circumstances very well.

The only motion under the old rules was one to the effect that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair. On those occasions, no one knew whether or not there would be a budget presentation. That was the point which the hon. member for Edmonton West, in his then capacity as Speaker of the House, made.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is a very good precedent.

Mr. Speaker: He was perfectly right, and I agree with him.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But there is a great distinction.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There is a very great distinction.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to get involved in debate with the hon. member. I agree with the ruling which he made at that time, and I say that although the rules have been changed since then the principle continues the same, and there is still no procedural requirement for a budget presentation. There was no procedural requirement then for a bill implementing the ways and means resolution to be based on a budget presentation.